

Institut für Mathematik ³
Universität Potsdam
Am Neuen Palais 10
14469 Potsdam
Germany

On a Classification of Irreducible Almost-Commutative Geometries V

Jan-Hendrik Jureit¹ & Christoph A. Stephan^{2,3}

Abstract

We extend a classification of irreducible, almost-commutative geometries whose spectral action is dynamically non-degenerate, to internal algebras that have six simple summands.

We find essentially four particle models: An extension of the standard model by a new species of fermions with vectorlike coupling to the gauge group and gauge invariant masses, two versions of the electro-strong model and a variety of the electro-strong model with Higgs mechanism.

PACS-92: 11.15 Gauge field theories

MSC-91: 81T13 Yang-Mills and other gauge theories

¹ Privatgelehrter, Kiel (Germany)

² christophstephan@gmx.de

1 Introduction

The classification presented here is based on the formulation of the standard model in the language of spectral triples [1], especially its recent development [2, 3] for spectral triples in KO-dimension six. We continue the classification of finite, real spectral triples begun in [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. So far spectral triples with up to four summands in the finite matrix algebra have been considered, in KO-dimension zero [4, 5, 6, 7] as well as KO-dimension six [8].

Here we will investigate the case with six summands in the matrix algebra of a finite spectral triple in KO-dimension six. This classification is again with respect to a “shopping list” consisting of heteroclitic criteria. For the exact definitions we refer to [4, 8].

Two criteria are motivated from perturbative quantum field theory of the non-gravitational part in flat timespace: vanishing Yang-Mills anomalies and dynamical non-degeneracy. The later imposes that the number of possible fermion mass equalities be restricted to the minimum and that they be stable under renormalization flow.

Two criteria are motivated from particle phenomenology: We want the fermion representation to be complex under the little group in each of its irreducible components, because we want to distinguish particles from anti-particles by means of unbroken charges. We want possible massless fermions to remain neutral under the little group, i.e. not to couple to massless gauge bosons.

Two criteria are motivated from the hope that, one day, we will have a unified quantum theory of all forces: vanishing mixed gravitational Yang-Mills anomalies and again dynamical non-degeneracy.

Again heavy use of Krajewski diagrams was made [9]. We consider only minimal Krajewski diagrams. These were obtained with help of an computer algebra program [10] especially developed for this task. This program already proved to be extremely useful in the previous classifications.

Unfortunately the computational time diverges rapidly when increasing the number of summands in the matrix algebra. While for up to four summands only ~ 20 minimal Krajewski diagrams appear the case of six summands with 72 diagrams is much more complicated. Luckily the diagrams fall into equivalent classes, i.e. all possible relative direction of the arrows appear, and so they allow a relatively compact notation by deleting the arrow heads [8]. But nevertheless all of the diagrams have to be found and analysed; this becomes an increasingly difficult terrain.

Surprisingly the number of particles models remains rather small. We find again the electro-strong model [6] and two extensions of it. But the prominent role is played by a model which turns out to contain the standard model as a sub-model. Considering the number of minimal Krajewski diagrams this is quite an astonishing result.

It would of course be desirable to understand the origin of the internal space, i.e. the source of the matrix algebra. There are hints that a connection to loop quantum gravity exists [11]. Also double Fell bundles seem a plausible structure in noncommutative geometry [12]. They could provide a deep connection to category theory and give better insights into the mathematical structure of almost-commutative geometries such as the standard model.

Another open problem is the mass mechanism for neutrinos. In KO-dimension zero the masses are of Dirac type [13, 14, 15], while KO-dimension six also allows for Majorana masses [2, 3] and the SeeSaw mechanism, although minor problems concerning an axiom of noncommutative geometry may occur [16]. Another possibility lies in the modification of the spectral action [17].

For a numerical analysis of the standard model with SeeSaw mechanism we refer to [3, 18, 19] for the models with three and four summands in the matrix algebra.

2 Statement of the result

We consider a finite, real, irreducible spectral triple in KO-dimension six whose algebra has six simple summands and the extended lift as described in [20]. Consider the list of all Yang-Mills-Higgs models induced by these triples and lifts. Discard all models that have either

- a dynamically degenerate fermionic mass spectrum,
- Yang-Mills or gravitational anomalies,
- a fermion multiplet whose representation under the little group is real or pseudo-real,
- or a massless fermion transforming non-trivially under the little group.

The remaining models are the following, A and E is the number of colours, the gauge group is on the left-hand side of the arrow, the little group on the right-hand side:

The standard model type: $A \geq 2, E \geq 2$

$$U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(A) \times U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times SU(A) \times U(1) \times SU(E)$$

This model contains for $A = 3$ one generation of the standard model in its four-summand version [6] and a vectorlike multiplet of new particles with $SU(E)$ colour. For details see diagram 2.

We have the following sub-models

$$U(1) \times SO(2) \times SU(A) \times U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times SU(A) \times U(1) \times SU(E),$$

$$U(1) \times SU(2) \times SO(A) \times U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times SO(A) \times U(1) \times SU(E)$$

and

$$U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(A) \times SO(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times SU(A) \times SO(E).$$

The last sub-model loses one of the $U(1)$ subgroups since only a linear combination couples to the fermions. It follows that the second $U(1)$ becomes unphysical and is not present in the spectral action.

If A or E are even we may also have the corresponding symplectic groups as subgroups. The sub-models contain again each two sub-models where one of the special unitary groups is replaced by a special orthogonal or, if the dimension is even, symplectic group. Note that in this case there is always only one $U(1)$ coming from the unitary group which is left.

Electro-strong models without Higgs mechanism: These models do not contain a Higgs scalar and all the fermions couple vectorially to the gauge group. There are two models with the following gauge groups

$$U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times SU(E),$$

$$U(1) \times U(1) \times SU(A) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times U(1) \times SU(A) \times SU(E)$$

and for the second case the obvious sub-models with orthogonal or symplectic subgroups.

Electro-strong models with Higgs mechanism: Here the $U(1)$ subgroup is broken through the Higgs mechanism:

$$U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \times SU(E)$$

In this model two of the fermion species have chiral $U(1)$ charges while being $SU(E)$ singlets. The fluctuations of the Dirac operator produce a complex Higgs scalar. The third fermion species has vectorlike couplings to the gauge group and its mass matrix is gauge invariant. One finds that the minimum of the corresponding Higgs potential is non-degenerate.

3 Diagram by diagram

We will use the following letters to denote algebra elements and unitaries: Let $\mathcal{A} = M_A(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_B(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_C(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_D(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_E(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_F(\mathbb{C}) \ni (a, b, c, d, e, f)$. The extended lift is defined by

$$L(u, v, w, x, y, z) := \rho(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{w}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}) J \rho(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{w}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}) J^{-1} \quad (1)$$

with

$$\hat{u} := u (\det u)^{q_{11}} (\det v)^{q_{12}} (\det w)^{q_{13}} (\det x)^{q_{14}} (\det y)^{q_{15}} (\det z)^{q_{16}} \in U(A), \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{v} := v (\det u)^{q_{21}} (\det v)^{q_{22}} (\det w)^{q_{23}} (\det x)^{q_{24}} (\det y)^{q_{25}} (\det z)^{q_{26}} \in U(B), \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{w} := w (\det u)^{q_{31}} (\det v)^{q_{32}} (\det w)^{q_{33}} (\det x)^{q_{34}} (\det y)^{q_{35}} (\det z)^{q_{36}} \in U(C), \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{x} := x (\det u)^{q_{41}} (\det v)^{q_{42}} (\det w)^{q_{43}} (\det x)^{q_{44}} (\det y)^{q_{45}} (\det z)^{q_{46}} \in U(D), \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{y} := y (\det u)^{q_{51}} (\det v)^{q_{52}} (\det w)^{q_{53}} (\det x)^{q_{54}} (\det y)^{q_{55}} (\det z)^{q_{56}} \in U(E), \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{z} := z (\det u)^{q_{61}} (\det v)^{q_{62}} (\det w)^{q_{63}} (\det x)^{q_{64}} (\det y)^{q_{65}} (\det z)^{q_{66}} \in U(F), \quad (7)$$

with $q_{ij} \in \mathbb{Q}$ and unitaries $(u, v, w, x, y, z) \in U(M_A(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_B(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_C(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_D(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_E(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_F(\mathbb{C}))$. It is understood that for instance if $A = 1$ we set $u = 1$ and $q_{j1} = 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$. If $M_A(\mathbb{C})$ is replaced by $M_A(\mathbb{R})$ or $M_{A/2}(\mathbb{H})$ we set $q_{j1} = 0$ and $q_{1j} = 0$.

To simplify the notation we introduce as in [20] the central charge matrix Q

$$Q := (q_{ij}) \quad (8)$$


where we do not spell out the columns which are identically zero due to the reasons just stated above. We will write the transpose Q^t of the hypercharge matrix for obvious type setting reasons.

All the minimal Krajewski diagrams can be found at the end of this paper. The arrows in the Krajewski diagrams are not oriented to obtain a shorter notation. Each arrow is allowed to have any orientation with respect to the other arrows. All minimal Krajewski diagrams for six summands in the matrix algebra contain 2 or 3 arrows. It follows that each diagram encodes 2 or $2^2 = 4$ Krajewski diagrams with oriented arrows (the orientation of one arrow can be fixed arbitrarily, only the relative orientations matter).

Diagram 1:

Since we are only dealing with minimal Krajewski diagrams we can arbitrarily choose an orientation for the arrows. All the other possible orientations are implicitly covered by the choice of the representation of the algebra being the fundamental or its complex conjugate. This would be no longer possible if non-minimal Krajewski diagrams were considered since the orientation of the arrows, i.e. choosing which fermions are left-handed or right-handed, may allow for new mass terms in the fermionic mass matrix. For simplicity all arrows will point into the same direction, namely to the left.

Diagram 1 then takes its oriented form:



We read off the following representation for the algebra

$$\rho_L = \begin{pmatrix} b \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_1 b \otimes 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_2 b \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R = \begin{pmatrix} c \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_1 c \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_2 c \otimes 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & f \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\rho_L^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_B \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_B \otimes d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_B \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_C \otimes a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_C \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_C \otimes d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1_F \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

and the mass matrix:

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \otimes 1_A & M_2 \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_3 \otimes 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & M_4 \otimes 1_D \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_1, M_2, M_3 \in M_{B \times C}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_4 \in M_{B \times F}(\mathbb{C}). \quad (10)$$

As in [7] the parameters β_1, β_2 and γ_1, γ_2 take values ± 1 and distinguish between fundamental representation and its complex conjugate: ${}^1b := b$, ${}^{-1}b := \bar{b}$. The colour algebras consist of as , ds and es . To obtain a non-degenerate mass spectrum we must impose $B = 1$ otherwise we would obtain at least two or more massless states (this procedure was named “neutrino counting” in [4] and proved to be an extremely efficient tool to identify degenerate mass spectra). Additionally these massless fermions would in general be charged under the little group, so models with $B \geq 2$ fail at least in two ways to meet our constraints. Furthermore, if $B = 1$ anomaly cancellation imposes $A = 1$, $C = 1$ and $F = 1$.

So we are left with a model with two unbroken colour algebras $M_D(\mathbb{C})$ and $M_E(\mathbb{C})$. The unitaries of these two matrix algebras are to be lifted to the Hilbert space and the central extension of the lift is required to be free of anomalies.

Let us assume that $D \geq 2$ and $E \geq 2$, so there are two $U(1)$ ’s in the central extension.

For $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2) = (+, +, +, +), (+, -, +, +), (-, +, +, -), (-, -, +, -)$ we find the following central charge matrix for the anomaly free central charges:

$$Q^t = \begin{pmatrix} q_{14} = -p & q_{24} = p & q_{34} = p & q_{44} = q & q_{54} = r & q_{64} = p \\ q_{16} = -p & q_{26} = p & q_{36} = p & q_{46} = s & q_{56} = t & q_{66} = p \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

with $p, q, r, s, t \in \mathbb{Q}$. All fermions possess vectorlike hypercharges, so the gauge group $U(1) \times U(1) \times SU(D) \times SU(E)$ is unbroken.

But the fermions represented by the double arrow in the a -line of the Krajewski diagram have vanishing hypercharge and are neutral under the little group.

All the other possibilities for $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ contain also at least one irreducible chiral lepton with vanishing hypercharge.


The cases $D = 1, E \geq 2$ and $D \geq 2, E = 1$ have just one colour algebra and consequently just one $U(1)$ subgroup in the gauge group. But as before the anomaly free

lift implies at least one lepton with vanishing hypercharge for all possible configurations of $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.

Note that the Krajewski diagram 1 may be enlarged to become an anomaly free model with the standard model as a sub-model. It is then no longer a minimal Krajewski diagram but it provides an interesting model beyond the standard model, closely related to Okun's theta particle model [21]. This extension has been studied in detail in [22]

Diagram 2:

We take again the Krajewski diagram with all arrows pointing to the left:



Here the dotted arrows indicate the sub-diagram which can produce the standard model as a sub-model.

We read off the following representation for the algebra:

$$\rho_L = \begin{pmatrix} b \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta b \otimes 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^1 c \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^2 c \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma^3 c \otimes 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & f \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\rho_L^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_B \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_B \otimes d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_C \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_C \otimes a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_C \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_C \otimes d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1_F \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

and for the mass matrix:

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \otimes 1_A & M_2 \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_3 \otimes 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & M_4 \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_1, M_2, M_3 \in M_{B \times C}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_4 \in M_{C \times F}(\mathbb{C}). \quad (13)$$

Anomaly cancellation, a non-degenerate mass spectrum and unbroken colour enforce $C = 1$ and $F = 1$. Furthermore the constraint of a non-degenerate mass spectrum leaves us with two possibilities for B , namely $B = 1$ and $B = 2$.

The first possibility, $B = 1$, produces the same models as diagram 1.

The second possibility, $B = 2$, enforces $D = 1$ to evade massless particles charged under the little group. So there are two colour algebras, $M_A(\mathbb{C})$ which is the usual colour algebra of the quarks and $M_E(\mathbb{C})$ which is the colour algebra of the new vectorlike leptons corresponding to M_4 , we call them X-particles. Altogether we have therefore three $U(1)$ subgroups in the gauge group.

Let us first consider the configurations $(\beta, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) = (+, -, +, +), (+, +, -, +), (-, -, +, +), (-, +, -, +), (+, -, +, -), (+, +, -, -), (-, -, +, -), (-, +, -, -)$.

If $A \geq 2$ and $E \geq 2$ we find the following two central charge matrices which provide for anomaly free lifts:

$$Q_1^t = \begin{pmatrix} q_{11} = p & q_{21} = 0 & q_{31} = pA - 1 & q_{41} = -(pA - 1) & q_{51} = p & q_{61} = pA - 1 \\ q_{12} = q & q_{22} = \frac{1}{2} & q_{32} = qA & q_{42} = -qA & q_{52} = r & q_{62} = qA \\ q_{15} = p - \frac{1}{A} & q_{25} = 0 & q_{35} = pA - 1 & q_{45} = -(pA - 1) & q_{55} = s & q_{65} = pA - 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

$$Q_1^t = \begin{pmatrix} q_{11} = p & q_{21} = 0 & q_{31} = pA - 1 & q_{41} = -(pA - 1) & q_{51} = p & q_{61} = pA - 1 \\ q_{12} = q & q_{22} = \frac{1}{2} & q_{32} = qA & q_{42} = -qA & q_{52} = r & q_{62} = qA \\ q_{15} = 0 & q_{25} = 0 & q_{35} = 0 & q_{45} = 0 & q_{55} = s & q_{65} = 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

with $p, q, r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$. For the standard model sub-model the hypercharges of all three $U(1)$ s are proportional. Therefore we can choose our basis, as in the case of the pure standard model [6], in such a way that only one linear combination of the three $U(1)$ s is relevant to the standard model particles. We call this linear combination $U(1)_Y$ since it constitutes the hypercharge group. The new X-particles corresponding to M_4 are charged under all three $U(1)$ s. Rotating first to the standard model basis leaves us with one more rotation in the X-particle sector, so effectively the new particles are charged under $U(1)_Y$ and a second $U(1)_X$. One linear combination of the three $U(1)$ s always decouples and is not present in the spectral action.

The standard model sector exhibits the same Higgs mechanism as the pure standard model [3] while the X-particles couple vectorially to the gauge group and have therefore gauge invariant masses. So the gauge group is broken and we have:

$$U(1)_Y \times SU(2) \times SU(A) \times U(1)_X \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1)_{em} \times SU(A) \times U(1)_X \times SU(E) \quad (16)$$

Note that the sub-representation on the standard model Hilbert space still has the non-trivial kernel $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_A$. But these elements of $U(1)_Y$ are not necessarily in the kernel of the sub-representation on the X-particle Hilbert space.

Finally, if $A = 1$ or $E = 1$ or both we find anomaly free lifts which correspond to simply setting the central charges q_{j1} or q_{j5} in the charge matrices (14) and (15) to zero.

For $A \geq 2$, $E = 1$ we find

$$U(1)_Y \times SU(2) \times SU(A) \times U(1)_X \rightarrow U(1)_{em} \times SU(A) \times U(1)_X, \quad (17)$$

This model is very similar to the AC-model presented in [23] which contains two new particles of the X-type. For $A = 1$, $E \geq 2$

$$U(1)_Y \times SU(2) \times U(1)_X \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1)_{em} \times U(1)_X \times SU(E) \quad (18)$$

which is an extension of the electro-weak model in [6]. If $A = 1$ and $E = 1$ we have

$$U(1)_Y \times SU(2) \rightarrow U(1)_{em}, \quad (19)$$


because in this case only one $U(1)$ remains to be lifted.

The eight other possibilities $(\beta, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$ lead for any A and E to models containing at least one irreducible chiral lepton with vanishing hypercharge.

Diagrams 3, 4 and 6 produce the same models as diagram 2. The arrows of the standard model particles can be easily identified using the list of Krajewski diagrams in [24].

Diagram 5 behaves as diagram 1.

Diagram 7 yields with our standard orientation for the arrows:



The representation of the algebra is then found to be

$$\rho_L = \begin{pmatrix} b \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & {}^\alpha a \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R = \begin{pmatrix} c \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\rho_L^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_B \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_A \otimes \beta b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_A \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_C \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_D \otimes \beta b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_F \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

and the mass matrix we find

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_3 \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_1 \in M_{B \times C}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_2 \in M_{A \times D}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_3 \in M_{A \times F}(\mathbb{C}). \quad (21)$$

To obtain models with unbroken colour algebras that are free of massless particles charged under the little group, we have to choose $A = B = C = D = F = 1$. Furthermore $E \geq 2$ and $M_E(\mathbb{C})$ has to be over the complex numbers since otherwise there would be no $U(1)$ to be lifted.

For $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta) = (+, +, +), (-, +, +)$ we find the anomaly free charge matrices

$$Q_1^t = (q_{15} = -q \quad q_{25} = q \quad q_{35} = -p \quad q_{45} = p \quad q_{55} = r \quad q_{65} = -q) \quad (22)$$

and

$$Q_2^t = (q_{15} = p \quad q_{25} = q \quad q_{35} = q \quad q_{45} = p \quad q_{55} = r \quad q_{65} = p), \quad (23)$$

with $p, q, r \in \mathbb{Q}$. While Q_1 has irreducible leptons with vanishing hypercharge, Q_2 provides an extension of the electro-strong model [6] by one set of particles coupling vectorially to the gauge group. The unbroken gauge group is

$$U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times SU(E). \quad (24)$$

For $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta) = (+, -, +), (+, +, -), (-, -, +), (-, +, -)$ we find three anomaly free charge matrices:

$$Q_1^t = (q_{15} = p \quad q_{25} = q \quad q_{35} = q \quad q_{45} = p \quad q_{55} = r \quad q_{65} = p), \quad (25)$$

$$Q_2^t = (q_{15} = -q \quad q_{25} = p \quad q_{35} = -2q + p \quad q_{45} = p \quad q_{55} = r \quad q_{65} = -p), \quad (26)$$

$$Q_3^t = (q_{15} = p \quad q_{25} = 0 \quad q_{35} = p - q \quad q_{45} = q \quad q_{55} = r \quad q_{65} = p) \quad (27)$$

with $p, q, r \in \mathbb{Q}$. Q_1 and Q_2 produce the same extension of the electro-strong model as above.

The charge matrix Q_3 leads to chiral couplings and consequently we get, by virtue of the fluctuations of the mass matrices M_1 and M_2 , a complex Higgs scalar h ,

$$\varphi_1 = \sum_i r_i (\det y)^{-(p+q)} M_1 = M_1 h, \quad \varphi_2 = \sum_i r_i (\det y)^{p+q} M_2 = M_2 \bar{h}, \quad r_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (28)$$

for which the Higgs potential has a non-degenerate minimum. The third mass M_3 is gauge invariant, similarly to the electro-strong model. The Higgs mechanism breaks the gauge group

$$U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \times SU(E). \quad (29)$$

Here we have included the finite subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2$ which we usually do not spell out explicitly. The remaining possibilities for $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta)$ have the anomaly free charge matrix

$$Q^t = (q_{15} = -p + q + r \quad q_{25} = p \quad q_{35} = q \quad q_{45} = r \quad q_{55} = s \quad q_{65} = -p + q + r) \quad (30)$$


with $p, q, r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$. This leads again to chiral $U(1)$ couplings and we find the same Higgs mechanism as above with

$$U(1) \times SU(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \times SU(E), \quad (31)$$

where again the fluctuations of M_1 and M_2 produce the complex Higgs scalar, while M_3 is a gauge invariant mass term.

Diagrams 8,9 and 10 produce the same models as diagram 7.

Diagram 11 yields:



From the Krajewski diagram we read off the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_L &= \begin{pmatrix} a \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_1 a \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix}, & \rho_R &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 a \otimes 1_C & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix}, \\ \rho_L^c &= \begin{pmatrix} 1_A \otimes b & 0 \\ 0 & 1_A \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, & \rho_R^c &= \begin{pmatrix} 1_A \otimes c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_D \otimes b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_F \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and the mass matrix


$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1_A \otimes M_1 & M_2 \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_3 \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_1 \in M_{B \times C}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_2 \in M_{A \times D}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_3 \in M_{A \times F}(\mathbb{C}). \quad (33)$$

The models produce either massless particles charged under the little group, anomalous models or possess particles with vanishing charge.

Diagram 12 shares the fate of diagram 11.

Diagram 13 yields:



We find the representation

$$\rho_L = \begin{pmatrix} b \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R = \begin{pmatrix} c \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\rho_L^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_B \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_C \otimes {}^\beta b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_B \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_R^c = \begin{pmatrix} 1_C \otimes a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_D \otimes {}^\beta b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_F \otimes e \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

and the mass matrix

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \otimes 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 \otimes 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_3 \otimes 1_E \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_1 \in M_{B \times C}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_2 \in M_{C \times D}(\mathbb{C}), \quad M_3 \in M_{B \times F}(\mathbb{C}). \quad (35)$$

A non-degenerate mass spectrum, unbroken colours and the absence of harmful anomalies requires $B = C = D = F = 1$ and $A \geq 2$ or $E \geq 2$ being complex matrix algebras. If either $A = 1$ or $E = 1$ the diagram is treated as diagram 7.

If both $A \geq 2$ and $E \geq 2$ and complex then we find an anomaly free lift with charge matrix

$$Q^t = \begin{pmatrix} q_{11} = p & q_{21} = q & q_{31} = q & q_{41} = q & q_{51} = r & q_{61} = q \\ q_{15} = s & q_{25} = t & q_{35} = t & q_{45} = t & q_{55} = l & q_{65} = t \end{pmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

$p, q, r, s, t, l \in \mathbb{Q}$, where the hypercharges and colour groups couple vectorially. This result holds for all (β) . Consequently all three mass matrices are gauge invariant and the gauge group is unbroken:

$$U(1) \times U(1) \times SU(A) \times SU(E) \rightarrow U(1) \times U(1) \times SU(A) \times SU(E). \quad (37)$$

We have therefore an electro-strong model with two colour groups and two hypercharge groups. Note that the representation does not allow to choose a linear combination that decouples one $U(1)$ subgroup as in the standard model.

Diagrams 14, 15 and 16 produce the same models as diagram 13.

Diagram 17 has no unbroken colour and thus no $U(1)$ to lift.

Diagram 18: This diagram is treated the same way as diagram 2 with the restriction $A = 1$.

Diagram 19 gives the same models as diagram 1, i.e. at least one fermion has vanishing charge.

4 Conclusion and outlook

For three and four summands in the matrix algebra we essentially found only the standard model and the electro-strong model as compatible models for our “shopping list”, [4, 5, 6, 8]. Of course there were a few sub-models due to the fact that the gauge group has orthogonal or, if the dimension permits, symplectic subgroups. These sub-models exist also in the extension of the standard model found in this paper.

Here we considered the case of six summands, which again provided a relatively sparse list of models. Apart from the electro-strong model, possibly enlarged by an extra colour group and with the possibility of a Higgs mechanism, the standard model took again its prominent place. It comes as a sub-model and is accompanied by an extra species of fermions, the X-particles which couple vectorially to the standard model gauge group. The standard model gauge group appears as a subgroup of a larger gauge group since the X-particles are allowed to possess their own colour group. This new model is a smaller version of the already known AC-model [23] which has proven to provide for an interesting dark matter candidate [25].

Taking into account that we have 72 minimal Krajewski diagrams for finite spectral triples with six summands in the matrix algebra (if all possible arrow configurations are counted), it is quite astonishing to find so few different particle models.

An other surprising result is the empirical fact that all possible arrow orientations of a given minimal Krajewski diagram also constitute a minimal Krajewski diagram. This seems only to be true in KO -dimension six since there exist counterexamples in KO -dimension zero [4, 5, 6]. A general proof for any number of summands in the internal algebra would be desirable. It would greatly reduce the difficulties of finding all minimal Krajewski diagrams for a given number of summands in the internal algebra.

Again we are curious to know what happens with eight (and more) summands. A viable approach seems a restriction to extensions which contain the standard model as sub-model. This may keep the computational time reasonable.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the funding of his work by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

References

- [1] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, Academic Press (1994)
 A. Connes, *Noncommutative geometry and reality*, J. Math. Phys. 36 (1995) 6194
 A. Connes & M. Marcolli *Noncommutative Geometry, Quantum Fields and Motives* (2007) <http://www.alainconnes.org/>
 A. Connes, *Gravity coupled with matter and the foundation of noncommutative geometry*, hep-th/9603053, Comm. Math. Phys. 155 (1996) 109
 A. Chamseddine & A. Connes, *The spectral action principle*, hep-th/9606001, Comm. Math. Phys. 182 (1996) 155
- [2] J. Barrett, *A Lorentzian version of the non-commutative geometry of the standard model of particle physics*, hep-th/0608221, J. Math. Phys. 48 (2007)012303
- [3] A. Connes, *Noncommutative geometry and the standard model with neutrino mixing*, hep-th/0608226, JHEP 0611 (2006) 081
 A. Chamseddine, A. Connes & M. Marcolli, *Gravity and the standard model with neutrino mixing*, hep-th/0610241
- [4] B. Iochum, T. Schücker & C.A. Stephan, *On a classification of irreducible almost commutative geometries*, hep-th/0312276, J. Math. Phys. 45 (2004) 5003
- [5] J.-H. Jureit & C.A. Stephan, *On a classification of irreducible almost commutative geometries, a second helping*, hep-th/0501134, J. Math. Phys. 46 (2005) 043512
- [6] J.-H. Jureit, T. Schücker & C.A. Stephan, *On a classification of irreducible almost commutative geometries III*, hep-th/0503190, J. Math. Phys. 46 (2005) 072303

- [7] T. Schücker, *Krajewski diagrams and spin lifts*, hep-th/0501181
- [8] J.-H. Jureit & C.A. Stephan, *On a classification of irreducible almost commutative geometries IV*, hep-th/0610040, J.Math.Phys. 49 (2008) 033502
- [9] M. Paschke & A. Sitarz, *Discrete spectral triples and their symmetries*, q-alg/9612029, J. Math. Phys. 39 (1998) 6191
T. Krajewski, *Classification of finite spectral triples*, hep-th/9701081, J. Geom. Phys. 28 (1998) 1
- [10] J.-H. Jureit & C.A. Stephan, *Finding the standard model of particle physics: A Combinatorial problem*, hep-th/0503085, Comput.Phys.Comm. 178 (2008) 230-247
- [11] J. Aastrup & J. Grimstrup, *Spectral triples of holonomy loops*, hep-th/0503246, Commun. Math. Phys. 264 (2006) 657
J.Aastrup & J. Grimstrup, *Intersecting Connes noncommutative geometry with quantum gravity*, hep-th/0601127, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 22 (2007) 1589
J.Aastrup, J.Grimstrup & R.Nest, *On Spectral Triples in Quantum Gravity I*, arXiv:0802.1783 [hep-th]
J.Aastrup, J. Grimstrup & R.Nest, *On Spectral Triples in Quantum Gravity II*, arXiv:0802.1784 [hep-th]
J.Aastrup, J.Grimstrup & R.Nest, *A new spectral triple over a space of connections*, arXiv:0807.3664 [hep-th]
- [12] R.A.D. Martins, *Double Fell bundles and Spectral triples*, arXiv:0709.2972 [math-ph]
R.A.D. Martins, *Some constructions in Category theory and Noncommutative geometry*, arXiv:0811.1485 [math-ph]
- [13] J.M. Gracia-Bondia, *Connes' interpretation of the standard model and massive neutrinos*, arXiv:hep-th/9502120, Phys. Lett. B 351 (1995)
- [14] C.A. Stephan, *Massive neutrinos in almost commutative geometry*, arXiv:hep-th/0608053, J. Math. Phys. 48 (2007) 023513
- [15] J. W. Barrett & R. A. Martins, *Non-commutative geometry and the standard model vacuum*, hep-th/0601192, J.Math.Phys. 47 (2006) 052305
R.A.D. Martins, *Finite temperature corrections and embedded strings in noncommutative geometry and the standard model with neutrino mixing* arXiv:0705.0613 [hep-th], J.Math.Phys. 48 (2007) 083509
- [16] C.A. Stephan, *Almost-commutative geometry, massive neutrinos and the orientability axiom in KO-dimension 6*, hep-th/0610097 (2006)
- [17] A. Sitarz, *Spectral action and neutrino mass*, arXiv:0808.4127 [math-ph] (2008)
- [18] J.-H. Jureit, T. Krajewski, T. Schücker & C.A. Stephan, *Seesaw and noncommutative geometry*, arXiv:0801.3731 [hep-th], Phys. Lett. B 654 (2007) 127

- [19] J.-H. Jureit, T. Krajewski, T. Schücker & C.A. Stephan, *On the noncommutative standard model*, arXiv:0705.0489 [hep-th], Acta Phys. Polon. B 38 (2007) 3181
- [20] S. Lazzarini & T. Schücker, *A farewell to unimodularity*, hep-th/0104038, Phys.Lett. B 510 (2001) 277
- [21] L.B. Okun, *Theta particles*, Nucl. Phys. B 173 (1980) 1
- [22] C.A. Stephan, *Almost-commutative geometries beyond the standard model II. New Colours* arXiv:0706.0595 [hep-th] J. Phys. A 40 (2007) 9941
- [23] C.A. Stephan, *Almost-commutative geometries beyond the standard model*, hep-th/ 0509213 J. Phys. A39 (2006) 9657
- [24] C.A. Stephan, *Krajewski diagrams and the Standard Model*, arXiv:0809.5137 [hep-th]
- [25] D. Fargion, M. Khlopov & C.A. Stephan, *Cold dark matter by heavy double charged leptons?*, astro-ph/0511789, Class. Quant. Grav. 23 (2006) 7305
M. Y. Khlopov & C.A. Stephan, *Composite dark matter with invisible light from almost-commutative geometry*, astro-ph/0603187




Diagram 1




Diagram 2




Diagram 3




Diagram 4




Diagram 5




Diagram 6




Diagram 7




Diagram 8




Diagram 9




Diagram 10




Diagram 11




Diagram 12




Diagram 13




Diagram 14




Diagram 15




Diagram 16




Diagram 17




Diagram 18




Diagram 19